

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box, 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/047,805	01/15/2002	Ping-Ho Chen	JCLA8069	4751	
75	90 03/16/2004		EXAMINER		
J.C. Patents, Inc. Suite 250			SHAFER,	RICKY D	
4 Venture			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Irvine, CA 92	618		2872	- 	
			DATE MAILED: 03/16/200-	DATE MAILED: 03/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/047,805	CHEN ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Ricky D. Shafer	2872				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reposition the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT cause the application to become ABA	ly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 D	ecember 2003.					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□	Claim(s) 1 and 4-6 is/are pending in the applic 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1 and 4-6 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	vn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•					
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date				
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/047,805

Art Unit: 2872

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 2

2. Claims 1 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergstedt ('302) in view of Kollmorgen ('230) or Clave et al ('236).

Bergstedt discloses a derotation mirror system within a common optical path panoramic stabilized periscope wherein the derotation system comprises a first surface reflecting mirror (D) positioned above a virtual reference surface (the common edge of the first and third reflecting mirrors) at a first included angle from the virtual reference surface, a second surface reflecting mirror (E) perpendicular to the virtual reference surface and a third surface reflecting mirror (F) positioned below the virtual reference surface at a second include angle form the virtual reference surface, wherein an input image is converted to an output image after several reflections via the first, second and third surface reflecting surfaces and the derotation system is capable of effecting a reverse half angle compensation for slew and platform angular rotation, note figures 1-4 along with the associated description thereof, expect for explicitly stating that the first included angle and the second inclined angle are substantially equal to 60 degrees.

Kollmorgen and Clave et al each teach it is known to use a "K-type optical system", wherein said K-type optical system includes a first surface reflecting mirror [(c), (1)], respectively, and a second surface reflecting mirror [(e), (2)], respectively, wherein the first

Application/Control Number: 10/047,805 Page 3

Art Unit: 2872

and second included angles are equal to 60 degrees in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of preventing image rotation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the first and the second included angles of Bergstedt to equal 60 degrees, as taught by Kollmorgen and Clave et al., in order to prevent image rotation.

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R.D. Shafer at telephone number (571) 272-2320

RDS-

08 March 2004